

Stepwise Choice of Covariates in High Dimensional Regression

Laurie Davies

Faculty of Mathematics

University of Duisburg-Essen, 45117 Essen, Federal Republic of Germany

e-mail:laurie.davies@uni-due.de

Abstract

Given data $\mathbf{y}(n)$ and $p(n)$ covariates $\mathbf{x}(n)$ one problem in linear regression is to decide which if any of the covariates to include. There are many articles on this problem but all are based on a stochastic model for the data. This paper gives what seems to be a new approach which does not require any form of model. It is conceptually and algorithmically simple and consistency results can be proved under appropriate assumptions. In the simulations in all but two case, where the results were comparable, it outperformed lasso based procedures sometimes by a considerable margin.

1 Introduction

Most if not all approaches for choosing covariates in high dimensional linear regression are based on the model

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{Y}(n) = \mathbf{X}(n)\boldsymbol{\beta}(n) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(n)$$

where just $k(n)$ of the $\beta_j(n)$, $j = 1, \dots, p(n)$ are non-zero or large, the remainder being zero or small. The following approach differs in that it is not based on the model (1) or indeed any model. Whether a covariate is included or not depends only on the degree to which it is better than standard Gaussian white noise.

More precisely, suppose that at one stage of the stepwise procedure a subset of the covariates of size $p_0 \leq n - 2$ has been included in the regression. Denote the indices of this subset by $\mathcal{S}_0$ and the sum of squared residuals by ss_0 . Now include the covariate $\mathbf{x}_j$ with $j \notin \mathcal{S}_0$ and denote the sum of squared residuals based on $\mathcal{S}_0 \cup \{j\}$ by ss_j . Including the best of the covariates not in $\mathcal{S}_0$ leads to a sum of squared residuals

$$ss_{01} = \min_{j \notin \mathcal{S}_0} ss_j.$$

The covariates not in $\mathcal{S}_0$ are now replaced in their entirety by standard Gaussian white noise. Including the random covariate corresponding to $\mathbf{x}_j$ leads to a random sum of squared residuals SS_j and including the best of the random covariates to a sum of squared residuals

$$SS_{01} = \min_{j \notin \mathcal{S}_0} SS_j.$$

The probability that the random covariates are better than the actual one given $\mathcal{S}_0$ is

$$\begin{aligned} P(SS_{01} < ss_{01}) &= 1 - P(SS_{01} \geq ss_{01}) = 1 - P(\min_{j \notin \mathcal{S}_0} SS_j \geq ss_{01}) \\ &= 1 - \prod_{j \notin \mathcal{S}_0} P(SS_j \geq ss_{01}) \end{aligned}$$

It can be shown that

$$(2) \quad SS_j \stackrel{D}{=} ss_0(1 - B_{1/2, (n-p_0-1)/2})$$

where $B_{a,b}$ denotes a beta random variable with parameters a and b and distribution function $\text{pbeta}(\cdot, a, b)$. This was a personal communication from Lutz Dümbgen: his proof is given in the appendix. It replaces the approximation based on the chi-squared distribution which was used in earlier versions of this paper. Thus

$$P(SS_j \geq ss_{01}) = \text{pbeta}(1 - ss_{01}/ss_0, 1/2, (n - p_0 - 1)/2)$$

so that finally

$$(3) \quad P(SS_{01} \leq ss_{01}) = 1 - \text{pbeta}(1 - ss_{01}/ss_0, 1/2, (n - p_0 - 1)/2)^{p(n)-p_0}.$$

This is the p -value for the inclusion of the next covariate. It is worth noting that (3) takes into account the number p_0 of covariates already active whose influence is small and the total number of covariates $p(n) - p_0$ not yet included whose influence is very large for large $p(n)$.

One proposal is simply to calculate the p -values (3) until the first one that exceeds a given α say $\alpha = 0.01$ and then include all previous covariates. This leads to the stopping rule

$$(4) \quad ss_{01} > ss_0 \left(1 - \text{qbeta}((1 - \alpha)^{1/(p(n)-p_0)}, 1/2, (n - p_0 - 1)/2) \right)$$

where $\text{qbeta}(\cdot, a, b)$ is the quantile function of the beta distribution with parameters a and b . The asymptotic version for large n and $p(n)$ is

$$(5) \quad ss_{01} > ss_0 \left(1 - (2 \log p(n) - \log \log(p(n)) - 2 \log(-\log(1 - \alpha)) - \log \pi)/n \right).$$

A proof is given in the appendix. The threshold $2 \log p(n)$ occurs in the theory of the lasso ([Bühlmann and van de Geer, 2011, Lockhart et al., 2014]).

The calculation of the p -values (3) does not require the choice of a regularization parameter. There is no need for cross-validation or indeed any form of simulation. Furthermore, as the procedure is not based on the linear model (1) it does not require an estimate for the error variance σ^2 in the model. The method

is invariant with respect to affine changes of units and to permutations of the covariates. It can be extended to robust regression, to non-linear approximations of the form $g(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta})$ if g has a Taylor expansion and to the Kullback-Leibler discrepancy where this is appropriate. In these extensions there is no exact form for the p -values corresponding to (3) but there exist simple approximations based on the chi-squared distribution.

The low birth weight data of [Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1989] were analysed in Chapter 11.6.1.2 of [Davies, 2014] using the standard logistic function. There an attempt was made to take the nature of the covariates into account, for example the covariate ‘Presence of Uterine Irritability’ is a 0-1 covariate and was replaced by a random covariate consisting of i.i.d. $\text{binom}(p, 1)$ random variables with p estimated from the data. In this paper only standard Gaussian white noise will be used. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly everything simplifies for reasonably large n giving concrete p -values obviating the need for simulations and so permitting large $p(n)$ to be handled. Secondly a consistency theorem can be proved based on the threshold $2 \log p(n)$ which has certain optimality properties. Nevertheless a short discussion is given on replacing the covariates by other forms of noise.

This paper is based on [Davies, 2016a, Davies, 2016b] which are restricted to linear approximations but, as the logistic example shows, the method extends without difficulty to functions the form $g(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta})$ with a Taylor expansion. The paper [Davies, 2016a] goes beyond the choice of covariates and considers non-significance regions in place of confidence regions for the values of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. This will not be considered here.

Stepwise regression is treated in Section 2; linear least squares regression in Section 2.1, M -regression in Section 2.2 and non-linear approximation in Section 2.3. A consistency result for least squares linear regression is proved in Section 2.4. Other forms of noise are considered in Section 2.5. Results of simulations following [van de Geer et al., 2014] and [Jia and Rohe, 2015] and results for real data are given in Section 2.6. The proofs of (2) and (5) are given in an appendix.

2 Stepwise regression

2.1 Least squares regression

As an example we take the leukemia data ([Golub et al., 1999]

<http://www-genome.wi.mit.edu/cancer/>

which was analysed in [Dettling and Bühlmann, 2003]. The number of patients is $n = 72$ with $p(n) = 3571$ covariates. The dependent variable takes on only the values 0 and 1 depending on whether the patient suffers from acute lymphoblastic leukemia or acute myeloid leukemia. The first five genes in order of

inclusion with their associated p -values as defined by (3) are as follows:

(6)	gene number	1182	1219	2888	1946	2102
	p -value	0.0000	8.57e-4	3.56e-3	2.54e-1	1.48e-1

According to this relevant genes are 1182, 1219 and 2888. Given these three genes the remaining 3568 are no better than random noise with respect to the two forms of leukemia. In particular gene 1946 is no better than random Gaussian noise. However if one does a simple linear regression of the dependent variable only on gene 1946 the p -value is 7.75e-9 as against 0.254. The reason is that a simple linear regression does not take into account that gene 1946 is the best of 3568 genes once genes 1182, 1219 and 2888 have been included. The p -value (3) takes this into account. The time required was 0.4 seconds using a Fortran 77 programme linked to R. The source code for beta distribution function was a double precision version of that given in [Press et al., 2003].

Interest in the above data centred on classifying patients based on their gene expression data. The p -values suggest that for this it is only necessary to base the classification on the genes 1182, 1219 and 2888. A simple linear regression results in one misclassification corresponding to a misclassification rate of 1.39%. In [Dettling and Bühlmann, 2003] the authors considered 42 classification procedures for this data; six different methods using seven different subsets of the genes of sizes 10,25,50,75,100,200 and 3571. Only two of them achieved a misclassification rate as low as 1.39%, namely the 1-nearest-neighbour method using 25 and 3571 genes. It is seen that for this particular data set the method attains a result equal to best of the methods of [Dettling and Bühlmann, 2003]. Moreover it specifies the relevant genes. Further data sets are considered in Section 2.6.

The above does not imply that 1182, 1219 and 2888 are the only relevant genes. To see this remove these genes and repeat the analysis. This leads to

(7)	gene number	1652	979	657	2260
	p -value	0.0000	9.36e-5	2.75e-2	2.22e-2.

The genes 1652, 979, 657 and 2260 can now be removed and the process continued. If this is done it results in 281 genes which are possibly relevant.

2.2 M -regression

The method can be applied to L_1 regression but with the disadvantage that there does not exist a simple expression corresponding to (3). If there is a particular interest in L_1 regression simulations will be required. If however L_1 regression is only used as a protection against outlying y -values this can be provided by M -regression for which an approximate version of (3) involving the chi-squared distribution is available.

Let ρ by a symmetric, positive and twice differentiable convex function with $\rho(0) = 0$. The default function will be the Huber's ρ -function with a tuning

constant c ([Huber and Ronchetti, 2009], page 69) defined by

$$(8) \quad \rho_c(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{u^2}{2}, & |u| \leq c, \\ c|u| - \frac{c^2}{2}, & |u| > c. \end{cases}$$

The default value of c will be $c = 1$.

For a given subset $\mathcal{S}_0$ of size p_0 the sum of squared residuals is replaced by

$$(9) \quad s_0(\rho, \sigma) = \min_{\beta(\mathcal{S}_0)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho \left(\frac{y_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0} x_{ij} \beta_j(\mathcal{S}_0)}{\sigma} \right).$$

which can be calculated using the algorithm described in **7.8.2** of [Huber and Ronchetti, 2009]. Typically only a few number of iterations are required. A proposal for the choice of σ is given below.

For some $\nu \notin \mathcal{S}_0$ put

$$(10) \quad s_\nu(\rho, \sigma) = \min_{\beta(\mathcal{S}_0 \cup \{\nu\})} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho \left(\frac{y_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0 \cup \{\nu\}} x_{ij} \beta_j(\mathcal{S}_0 \cup \{\nu\})}{\sigma} \right).$$

and

$$(11) \quad s_{01}(\rho, \sigma) = \min_{\nu \notin \mathcal{S}_0} s_\nu(\rho, \sigma).$$

Assume that ρ has first and second derivatives $\rho^{(1)}$ and $\rho^{(2)}$ respectively. On replacing the ν th covariate by standard Gaussian white noise a Taylor expansion gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho \left(\frac{r_i - bZ_i}{\sigma} \right) &\approx \sum_{i=1}^n \rho \left(\frac{r_i}{\sigma} \right) - \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho^{(1)} \left(\frac{r_i}{\sigma} \right) bZ_i \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho^{(2)} \left(\frac{r_i}{\sigma} \right) b^2 Z_i^2. \end{aligned}$$

where $r_i = y_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0} x_{ij} \beta_j(\mathcal{S}_0)$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} S_\nu(\rho, \sigma) &= \min_{\beta(\mathcal{S}_0), b} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho \left(\frac{y_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0} x_{ij} \beta_j(\mathcal{S}_0) - bZ_i}{\sigma} \right) \\ &\approx s_0(\rho, \sigma) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \rho^{(1)} \left(\frac{r_i}{\sigma} \right) Z_i \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \rho^{(2)} \left(\frac{r_i}{\sigma} \right) Z_i^2} \\ &\approx s_0(\rho, \sigma) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \rho^{(1)} \left(\frac{r_i}{\sigma} \right) \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \rho^{(2)} \left(\frac{r_i}{\sigma} \right)} \chi_1^2 \end{aligned}$$

and hence to the asymptotic p -value

$$(12) \quad 1 - \text{pchisq} \left(\frac{2s_0(\rho^{(2)}, \sigma)}{s_0(\rho^{(1)}, \sigma)} (s_0(\rho, \sigma) - s_{01}(\rho, \sigma)) \right)^{p(n) - p_0}.$$

corresponding to the exact p -value (3) for linear regression. Here

$$s_0(\rho^{(1)}, \sigma) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^{(1)} \left(\frac{r_i}{\sigma} \right)^2, \quad s_0(\rho^{(2)}, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^{(2)} \left(\frac{r_i}{\sigma} \right).$$

It remains to specify the choice of scale σ . The initial value of σ is the median absolute deviation of $\mathbf{y}(n)$ multiplied by the Fisher consistency factor 1.4826. If the $\mathbf{y}(n)$ have a large atom more care is needed. Let n_Δ be the size of the largest atom. Instead of the median of the absolute deviations from the median we now take the $0.5(n + n_\Delta)/n$ quantile (see Chapter 4 of [Davies, 2014]). This is of some consequence for the real data examples of Section 2.7 where the $\mathbf{y}(n)$ take on only the values zero and one. Let σ_0 denote the scale at some point of the procedure with p_0 covariates already included. After the next covariate has been included the new scale σ_1 is taken to be

$$(13) \quad \sigma_1^2 = \frac{1}{(n - p_0 - 1)c_f} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(r_1(i)/\sigma_0)^2$$

where the $r_1(i)$ are the residual based on the $p_0 + 1$ covariates and c_f is the Fisher consistency factor given by

$$c_f = \mathbf{E}(\psi(Z)^2)$$

where Z is $N(0, 1)$ (see [Huber and Ronchetti, 2009]). Other choices are also possible.

2.3 Non-linear approximation

The dependent variable $\mathbf{y}$ is now approximated by $g(\mathbf{x}(\mathcal{S})^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}))$ for some smooth function g . In the L_2 case

$$(14) \quad ss_0 = \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0)} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0)))^2.$$

Now include one additional covariate $\mathbf{x}_j$ with $j \notin \mathcal{S}_0$ to give $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}_0 \cup \{j\}$ and denote the sum of squared residuals by ss_1 as before. On replacing the x_{ij} by i.i.d. $N(0, 1)$ random variables Z_i a Taylor expansion gives

$$(15) \quad g(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0) + bZ_i) \approx g(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0)) + g^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))Z_i b.$$

Using this and minimizing

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0) + bZ_i))^2$$

over $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0)$ and b leads to

$$(16) \quad SS_1 \approx ss_0 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^2 g^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n g^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))^2} \chi_1^2$$

where

$$(17) \quad r_i(\mathcal{S}_0) = y_i - g(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0)).$$

The asymptotic p -value corresponding to the asymptotic p -value (12) for M -regression is

$$(18) \quad 1 - \text{pchisq} \left(\frac{(ss_0 - ss_1) \sum_{i=1}^n g^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^2 g^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))^2}, 1 \right)^{p(n) - p_0}.$$

If g is the logistic function $g(u) = \exp(u)/(1 + \exp(u))$

$$(19) \quad \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^2 g^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n g^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - p_i(0))^2 p_i(0)^2 (1 - p_i(0))^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i(0)^2 (1 - p_i(0))^2}$$

where

$$p_i(0) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))}{1 + \exp(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))}.$$

The opportunity is now taken to correct an error in [Davies, 2014]. The term

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^3 (1 - p_i)^3}{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^2 (1 - p_i)^2}$$

occurs repeatedly in Chapter 11.6.1.2 and should be replaced by

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - p_i)^2 p_i^2 (1 - p_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^2 (1 - p_i)^2}$$

agreeing with (19). The mistake is due to replacing $(y_i - p_i)^2$ by its ‘expected value’ $p_i(1 - p_i)$ which assumes the correctness of the model making it somewhat embarrassing and in direct contrast to the philosophy of this paper and also to the title of [Davies, 2014]. The software used the correct term (19) although in this particular example the difference is small.

Robust non-linear regression can be treated in the same manner but the expressions become unwieldy.

2.4 Kullback-Leibler and logistic regression

In some data sets, for example the leukemia data of Section 2.1, the dependent variable $\mathbf{y}(n)$ takes on only the values zero and one. For such data least squares combined with the logistic model can cause problems: it can happen that for some i the estimated probability is $p_i \geq 1 - 10^{-10}$ although $y_i = 0$. An example is provided by the colon cancer data ([Alon et al., 1999], <http://microarray.princeton.edu/oncology/>). The sample size is $n = 62$ and there are 2000 covariates. The logistic model based on least squares with a

cut-off p -value of 0.01 results in two covariates. If these two covariates are used to classify the cancer there are three errors. In two cases the probability based on the logistic model is one whereas the dependent variable has the value zero. In the third case the values are zero and one respectively.

The problem can be avoided by using the Kullback-Leibler discrepancy

$$(20) \quad KL(\mathbf{y}(n), \mathbf{x}(n), \boldsymbol{\beta}) = - \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i \log p(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + (1 - y_i) \log(1 - p(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}))).$$

The normalization factor for the asymptotic chi-squared distribution corresponding to (16) and (17) in the least squares case can be obtained by calculating the first and second derivatives of (20) with respect to the $p_i = p(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. In the case of logistic regression with

$$p(\mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}_i^t \boldsymbol{\beta})}{1 + \exp(\mathbf{x}_i^t \boldsymbol{\beta})}$$

(19) for the least squares minimization is replaced by

$$(21) \quad \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^2 g^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n g^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_i(\mathcal{S}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathcal{S}_0))^2} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - p_i(0))^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i(0)(1 - p_i(0))}.$$

for the Kullback-Leibler minimization. Thus asymptotically

$$(22) \quad \frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^n p_i(0)(1 - p_i(0))}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - p_i(0))^2} (kl_0 - KL_1) \approx \chi_1^2$$

where the $p_i(0)$ are the probabilities based on the covariates in $\mathcal{S}_0$ with Kullback-Leibler divergence kl_0 and KL_1 is the Kullback-Leibler divergence when a standard Gaussian white noise covariate is included. This leads to the asymptotic p -values

$$(23) \quad 1 - \text{pchisq} \left(\frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^n p_i(0)(1 - p_i(0))}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - p_i(0))^2} (kl_0 - kl_1) \right)^{p(n) - p(0)}.$$

Repeating the least squares analysis for the colon data but now using the Kullback-Leibler divergence results in the single gene number 377. The number of misclassifications based on this gene is nine. The second gene 356 has a p -value of 0.053. If this is included the number of misclassifications is reduced to two but the status of this second gene is not clear.

2.5 Consistency: $p(n) > k(n)$

To prove a consistency result a model with error term is necessary. It is defined as follows. There are p covariates $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p$ and the response $\mathbf{Y}$ is given by the

first k

$$(24) \quad \mathbf{Y} = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{x}_j \beta_j + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$$

where the $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ are i.i.d. Gaussian random variables with zero mean and variance σ^2 . Given a sample of size n both $k = k(n) = o(n)$ and $p = p(n)$ will be allowed to depend on n . Without loss of generality the covariates $\mathbf{x}_j(n)$ will be standardized to have L_2 norm n , that is $\|\mathbf{x}_j(n)\|_2^2 = n$.

A given subset of $\{1, \dots, k(n)\}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{S}_0(n)$. For $\nu \notin \mathcal{S}_0(n)$ the subset $\mathcal{S}_0(n) \cup \{\nu\}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{S}_{01}(n)$, the complements of $\mathcal{S}_0(n)$ and $\mathcal{S}_{01}(n)$ with respect to $\{1, \dots, k(n)\}$ by $\mathcal{S}_{12}(n)$ and $\mathcal{S}_2(n)$ respectively. The projection onto the linear space spanned by the $\mathbf{x}_j(n)$, $j \in \mathcal{S}_0(n)$, will be denoted by P_0 with the corresponding notation for $\mathcal{S}_{01}(n)$, $\mathcal{S}_{12}(n)$ and $\mathcal{S}_2(n)$. Finally put

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_0(n) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0(n)} \mathbf{x}_j(n) \beta_j(n)$$

with the corresponding definitions of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{01}(n)$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{12}(n)$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_2(n)$

Let $ss_0(n)$ and $ss_{01}(n)$ be the sum of squared residuals after regressing $\mathbf{Y}(n)$ on the covariates $\mathbf{x}_j(n)$ for j in $\mathcal{S}_0(n)$ and $\mathcal{S}_{01}(n)$ respectively. From $k_n = o(n)$ and the Gaussian assumption on the errors (which can be relaxed) it follows that the asymptotic values of $ss_0(n)$ and $ss_{01}(n)$ are given by

$$(25) \quad ssa_0(n) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{12}(n)^t (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{12}(n) - P_0(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{12}(n))) + n\sigma^2$$

$$(26) \quad ssa_{01}(n) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2(n)^t (\boldsymbol{\mu}_2(n) - P_{01}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2(n))) + n\sigma^2$$

respectively. Given n the covariates are specified sequentially up to but excluding the first covariate whose p -values exceeds $\alpha(n)$ for some sequence $\alpha(n)$ tending to zero but such that

$$(27) \quad -\log(-\log(1 - \alpha(n))) = o(\log(p(n))).$$

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that there exists a $\tau > 2$ and a $\tau' < 2$ such that for all n sufficiently large the following holds:*

(i) *for each proper subset $\mathcal{S}_0(n)$ of $\{1, \dots, k(n)\}$ there exists a $\nu \in \mathcal{S}_{12}(n)$ such that*

$$(28) \quad \left(1 - \frac{ssa_{01}(n)}{ssa_0(n)}\right) > \frac{\tau \log n}{n},$$

(ii) *for all subsets $\mathcal{S}_0(n)$ of $\{1, \dots, k(n)\}$ and for all $\nu > k(n)$*

$$(29) \quad \left(1 - \frac{ssa_{01}(n)}{ssa_0(n)}\right) < \frac{\tau' \log n}{n}.$$

Then the procedure described above is consistent.

Proof. For large n

$$n \left(1 - \frac{ss_{01}(n)}{ss_0(n)} \right) \asymp n \left(1 - \frac{ssa_{01}(n)}{ssa_0(n)} \right).$$

It follows from (4), (5), the choice of the $\alpha(n)$ and (i) of the theorem that if covariates $\mathbf{x}_j$ with $j \leq k(n)$ have been included then either all covariates $\mathbf{x}_j(n)$, $j \leq k(n)$ have been included or there exists at least one covariate $\mathbf{x}_\nu(n)$, $\nu \leq k(n)$ which is a candidate for inclusion. From (4), (5), the choice of $\alpha(n)$ and (ii) it follows that there is no covariate $\mathbf{x}_\nu(n)$ with $\nu > k(n)$ which is a candidate for inclusion. The procedure therefore continues until all covariates $\mathbf{x}_j(n)$, $j \leq k(n)$ are included and then terminates. $\square$

It is perhaps worth emphasizing that the theorem does not require that the covariates be uncorrelated. To take a concrete example put $p(n) = 2$ so that

$$\mathbf{Y}(n) = \mathbf{x}_1(n)\beta_1(n) + \mathbf{x}_2(n)\beta_2(n) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(n)$$

where $\|\mathbf{x}_1(n)\|_2 = \|\mathbf{x}_2(n)\|_2$ and the correlation between $\mathbf{x}_1(n)$ and $\mathbf{x}_2(n)$ is $\rho(n)$. Suppose that $\beta_1(n)^2 > \beta_2(n)^2$ so that $\mathbf{x}_1(n)$ is the first candidate for inclusion. Then for large n $\mathbf{x}_1(n)$ will be included if

$$(\beta_1(n) + \rho\beta_2(n))^2 \geq \frac{\gamma \cdot \text{qchisq}(\sqrt{1 - \alpha(n)}, 1)}{n} (\sigma^2 + (1 - \rho(n)^2)\beta_2(n)^2)$$

for some $\gamma > 1$.

If however the covariates are orthogonal then (28) simplifies and becomes

$$(30) \quad \beta_\nu(n)^2 > \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_2(n)} \beta_j(n)^2 + \sigma^2 \right) \frac{\tau \log p(n)}{n}.$$

Theorem 1 of [Lockhart et al., 2014] gives a consistency result for orthogonal covariates with L_2 norm one, namely (in the present notation)

$$(31) \quad \min_{1 \leq j \leq k(n)} |\beta_j| - \sigma \sqrt{2 \log p(n)} \rightarrow \infty.$$

If more care is taken (30) can be expressed in the same manner with $\tau = 2$. At first glance (30) differs from (31) by the inclusion of $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_2(n)} \beta_j(n)^2$. However lasso requires a value for σ^2 which causes problems, particularly if $p(n) > k(n)$ (see [Lockhart et al., 2014]). The term $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_2(n)} \beta_j(n)^2 + \sigma^2$ is nothing more than approximation for $ss_0(n)/n$ and can therefore be interpreted, if one wishes, as an estimate for σ^2 based on the sum of squared errors of the covariates which are active at this stage.

2.6 Choice of noise

The procedure described above is based on Gaussian noise. This has the advantage of an exact explicit expression (3) for the p -values for the linear regression case. In the other cases considered in this paper there are simple asymptotic expressions for the for the p -value (12), (18) and (23). Furthermore the term $2 \log p(n)$ in (5) and Theorem 1 indicates that Gaussian noise is asymptotically optimal in the context of choice of covariates. Nevertheless it is perhaps of interest to consider other forms of noise.

If the Z_i are i.i.d. with mean zero and variance 1 and if

$$(32) \quad \frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} r_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i^2} = o(1)$$

the central limit theorem gives

$$(33) \quad \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i Z_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i^2}} \approx N(0, 1)$$

which combined with $\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i^2 \approx n$ gives the approximate p -value

$$(34) \quad 1 - \text{pchisq} \left(n \left(1 - \frac{ss_{01}}{ss_0} \right), 1 \right)^{p(n)-p_0}$$

which may be compared with the exact value (3). It agrees with (12) for $\rho(x) = x^2$.

Depending on the Z_i this approximation can be arbitrarily bad for any given n . If the approximation is good and if $p(n)$ is small and n much larger than p_0 the exact p -value (3) for Gaussian noise will be well approximated by (34).

For large $p(n)$ a large deviation result will be required to get an approximation corresponding to the threshold $2 \log p(n)$. The form of the approximation will depend on the entropy function $I(\cdot)$. For certain random variables, examples being $Z_i \stackrel{D}{=} U(-1, 1)$ and $Z_i = \pm 1$, the entropy function is $I(t) = -t^2/2$ which leads to the same asymptotic threshold as for Gaussian noise. The advantage of such distributions is that the asymptotics do not depend on the r_i . This is not the case if the entropy function is not quadratic as is the case for Laplace random variables. In summary there are good reasons for restricting the noise to Gaussian noise and there seem to be no good reasons for not doing so.

Finally one other possibility worth mentioning is to multiply each covariate by i.i.d. Gaussian noise. This leads to

$$(35) \quad SS_j \approx ss_0 - \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i x_{i,j} Z_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_{i,j}^2 r_i^2}$$

for the j th covariate and the approximation

$$(36) \quad SS_j \approx ss_0 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_{i,j}^2 r_i^2}{n} \chi_1^2$$

where, without loss of generality, the covariates are normalized to have L_2 norm n . The approximate p -value is

$$(37) \quad 1 - \prod_{j=1}^{p(n)} \text{pchisq} \left(\frac{n(ss_0 - ss_{01})}{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i^2 x_{ij}^2}, 1 \right).$$

This possibility will be pursued no further.

2.7 Simulations and real data

2.7.1 Simulations

Linear regression

The following three procedures will be used in the simulations. The simplest one to be denoted by Proc1 is to accept all the covariates defined by the stopping rule (4) with $\alpha = 0.01$. The second procedure to be denoted by Proc2 is to first precondition the data as in [Jia and Rohe, 2015] and, as in Proc1, accept all covariates defined by the stopping rule (4) with $\alpha = 0.01$. The third procedure to be denoted by Proc3 is to first precondition the data as in Proc2 but then to set $\alpha = 0.5$ in (4). This gives a list of candidate covariates. A simple linear regression is now performed using these covariates. Those covariates with a large p -value in the linear regression are excluded and the remaining covariates accepted. A large p -value is defined as follows: given $\alpha = 0.01$ as in Proc1 and Proc2 set the cut-off p -value in the linear regression to be $1 - (1 - \alpha)^{1/(p(n) - p_0)}$ as in (4). As α is small and $p(n)$ large with respect to p_0 this corresponds approximately to a p -values of $\alpha/p(n)$. This is somewhat ad hoc but it may be possible to give it some theoretical underpinning. But whether this it is ad hoc or not it specifies a well defined procedure which can be compared with other procedures. At first sight it may appear that the use of p -values deriving from a linear regression implies the acceptance of the linear model (1). This is not so. In [Davies, 2016a] non-significance regions are defined based on random perturbations of the covariates. The resulting regions are asymptotically the same as the confidence regions derived from the linear model (1) but do not suppose it.

The first set of simulations we report are the equi-correlation simulations described in Section 4.1 of [van de Geer et al., 2014]. The sample size is $n = 100$ and the number of covariates is $p(n) = 500$. The covariates are generated as Gaussian random variables with covariance matrix Σ where $\Sigma_{ij} = 0.8, i \neq j$ and $\Sigma_{jj} = 1$. Four different scenarios are considered. The number of non-zero coefficients in the data generate according to the linear model is either $s_0 = 3$ or $s_0 = 15$ and they are all either i.i.d. $U(0, 2)$ or i.i.d. $U(0, 4)$. The error term in the model is i.i.d $N(0, 1)$.

Although [van de Geer et al., 2014] is concerned primarily with confidence interval Tables 5-8 give the results of simulations for testing all the hypotheses $H_{0,j} : \beta_j = 0$. This is equivalent to choosing those covariates $\mathbf{x}_j$ for which H_{0j} is rejected. The measures of performance are the power and the family-wise

	$s_0 = 3$				$s_0 = 15$			
	$U(0, 2)$		$U(0, 4)$		$U(0, 2)$		$U(0, 4)$	
Lasso-Pro	0.56	0.10	0.79	0.11	0.70	1.00	0.92	1.00
Proc1	0.60	0.19	0.79	0.07	0.25	0.97	0.46	0.96
Proc2	0.41	0.01	0.71	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.29	0.00
Proc3	0.55	0.12	0.79	0.07	0.44	0.26	0.73	0.09

Table 1: Power and family-wise error rate for the lasso-projection method of [van de Geer et al., 2014] and the three procedures based on p -values as described in this section.

error rate FWER. The power is the proportion of correctly identified active covariates. The FWER is the proportion of times the estimated set of active covariates contains a covariate which is not active. In Tables 6 and 8 of [van de Geer et al., 2014] the active covariates are chosen at random. As all three procedures Proc1, Proc2 and Proc3 are equivariant with respect to permutations of the covariates the active covariates are either $S_0 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ or $S_0 = \{1, \dots, 15\}$ as in Tables 5 and 7 of [van de Geer et al., 2014].

The results given in Table 1. The results for Lasso-Pro are taken from [van de Geer et al., 2014]. As is seen from Table 1 the best overall procedure is Proc3. In the case $s_0 = 3$ and $U(0, 2)$ coefficients it is slightly worse than Lasso-Pro but the difference could well be explicable by simulation variation as only 100 simulations were performed for Lasso-Pro. For Proc1, Proc2 and Proc3 500 simulations were performed.

Tables 1-4 of [van de Geer et al., 2014] give the results of some simulations on the covering frequencies and the lengths of confidence intervals. Again we shall restrict the comparisons to the four cases detailed above. The average cover for the active set S_0 is defined by

$$\text{Avgcov} = \frac{1}{s_0} \sum_{j \in S_0} \mathbf{P}(\beta_j^0 \in CI_j)$$

and the average length by

$$\text{Avglength} = \frac{1}{s_0} \sum_{j \in S_0} \text{length}(CI_j)$$

with analogous definitions for the complement S_0^c . The CI_j are the confidence intervals for the coefficients β_j^0 used to generate the data.

The 0.95-confidence intervals for the covariates for the procedures Proc1, Proc2 and Proc3 are calculated as follows. Let $\tilde{S}_0$ denote the estimated active set. For the covariates in $\tilde{S}_0$ the confidence intervals are those calculated from

		$s_0 = 3$				$s_0 = 15$			
		$U(0, 2)$		$U(0, 4)$		$U(0, 2)$		$U(0, 4)$	
Lasso-Pro	S_0	0.89	0.82	0.87	0.82	0.56	0.56	0.53	0.55
	S_0^c	0.95	0.80	0.96	0.80	0.93	0.57	0.93	0.56
Proc1	S_0	0.84	0.70	0.89	0.73	0.81	1.42	0.84	1.81
	S_0^c	0.91	0.76	0.93	0.78	0.78	1.43	0.84	1.82
Proc2	S_0	0.52	0.55	0.79	0.72	0.03	1.65	0.24	2.86
	S_0^c	0.48	0.63	0.80	0.79	0.02	1.71	0.23	2.96
Proc3	S_0	0.76	0.68	0.87	0.73	0.62	1.24	0.85	1.08
	S_0^c	0.77	0.75	0.89	0.78	0.60	1.26	0.87	1.09

Table 2: Average covering frequency and average length of interval for the four procedures, for S_0 and S_0^c and for the four simulation scenarios with specified covering probability 0.95. The Lasso-Pro results are taken from [van de Geer et al., 2014].

a simple linear regression. For a covariate in $\tilde{S}_0^c$ the confidence interval is calculated by appending this covariate to the set $\tilde{S}_0$, performing a linear regression and using confidence interval from this regression. Again it should be pointed out that these confidence intervals are not dependent on the linear model (1). They are asymptotically equivalent to the non-significance regions as defined in [Davies, 2016a] which are not based on (1).

The results are given in Table 2 with the Lasso-Pro results taken from [van de Geer et al., 2014]. For $s_0 = 3$ and $s_0 = 15$ the standard deviations of the estimates of the β_j are approximately 0.186 and 0.216 respectively. Thus for a coverage probability of γ the optimal lengths of the confidence intervals are approximately $2 \cdot 0.186 \cdot \text{qnorm}((1 + \gamma)/2)$ and $2 \cdot 0.216 \cdot \text{qnorm}((1 + \gamma)/2)$ respectively. For the Lasso-Pro procedure with the stated coverage probabilities the lengths of the confidence intervals for S_0 with $s_0 = 3$ are 78% for $U(0, 2)$ and 74% for $U(0, 4)$. For S_0^c and $s_0 = 3$ the corresponding percentages are 10% for $U(0, 2)$ and 5% for $U(0, 4)$. For S_0 with $s_0 = 15$ the percentages are 73% for $U(0, 2)$ and 85% for $U(0, 4)$. For S_0^c the intervals are approximately 25% shorter than the optimal intervals. The explanation would seem to be the following (personal communication from Peter Bühlmann). The theorems of [van de Geer et al., 2014] require $s_0 = o(\sqrt{n}/\log p(n))$ to guarantee an asymptotically valid uniform approximation and prevent super efficiency. On plugging in $n = 100$ and $p(n) = 500$ gives $s_0 = o(1.61)$ so that $s_0 = 15$ is, so to speak, not in the range of applicability of the theorems. The lengths for S_0^c with $s_0 = 3$ are only slightly longer than the optimal intervals so even here there may be a super efficiency effect.

The procedure Proc2 is dominated by each of Proc1 and Proc3 but neither of Proc1 and Proc3 dominates the other.

	$\rho = 0.85$									
	250		5000		10000		15000		30000	
Proc1	0.00	1.55	9.12	7.87	15.1	9.32	17.3	10.0	18.1	9.91
Proc2	20.0	0.00	15.7	0.01	17.7	0.00	17.2	0.00	18.6	0.01
Proc3	19.3	0.44	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.07	0.47	0.16	0.85	1.08
	$\rho = 0.05$									
	250		5000		10000		15000		30000	
Proc1	0.00	0.06	2.43	1.20	4.62	1.57	9.68	2.56	12.4	3.11
Proc2	19.85	0.00	13.48	0.00	15.8	0.00	17.4	0.00	18.2	0.01
Proc3	14.4	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.06	0.16	0.11	0.95	0.13

Table 3: Average number of false negatives (first number) and average number of false positives (second number) for each of the three procedures Proc1, Proc2 and Proc3 for different numbers of covariates and two values of ρ , 0.85 and 0.05.

Simulation experiments are reported in [Jia and Rohe, 2015]. The ones to be given here correspond to those of Figure 4 of [Jia and Rohe, 2015]. The sample size is $n = 250$ with $p(n) = 250, 5000, 10000, 15000$ and 30000. The covariates have covariance matrix Σ with $\Sigma_{ii} = 1$ and $\Sigma_{ij} = \rho, i \neq j$ with $\rho = 0.85$ and $\rho = 0.05$. The number of active covariates is $k = 20$ with coefficients $\beta_1 = \dots = \beta_{20} = 3$. The noise is i.i.d. $N(0, 1)$. The results are given in Table 3.

It is seen that Proc3 gives the best results for $p(n) = 5000, 10000, 15000$ and 30000 but fails in terms of false negatives for $p(n) = 250$. More generally Proc3 fails for $p(n)$ in the range 230-280. This seems to correspond to the peaks in the black ‘puffer’ lines of Figure 4 of [Jia and Rohe, 2015]. For $p(n)$ in the range 280-30000 Proc3 outperforms Proc1 and Proc2 and also all the methods in Figure 4 of [Jia and Rohe, 2015], particularly with respect to the number of false positives.

Logistic regression

Logistic regression was also considered in [van de Geer et al., 2014]. Table 4 gives the results of some simulations as described in [van de Geer et al., 2014]: it includes Table 9 of [van de Geer et al., 2014]. The sample size is $n = 100$ and the number of covariates is $p(n) = 500$. The covariates $\mathbf{x}$ are generated as Gaussian random variables with mean zero and covariance matrix Σ with $\Sigma_{ij} = 0.8^{|i-j|}$ for $i \neq j$ and $\Sigma_{ii} = 1$. The parameter β is given by $\beta_i = U(0, \eta), i = 1, 2, 3$ with $\eta = 1, 2, 4$ and $\beta_i = 0, i \geq 4$. The dependent variables y_i are generated as a independent binomial random variables $\text{binom}(p_i, 1)$ with $p_i = \exp(\mathbf{x}^t \beta_i) / (1 + \exp(\mathbf{x}^t \beta_i))$ (see [van de Geer et al., 2014]). The KL-procedure of the table is as described in Section 2.4 . The cut-off p -value is 0.01 so that all

covariates are included up to but excluding the first with a p -value exceeding 0.01.

Logistic regression				
measure	method	Toeplitz		
		$U(0, 1)$	$U(0, 2)$	$U(0, 4)$
Power	Lasso-ProG	0.06	0.27	0.50
	MS-Split	0.07	0.37	0.08
	KL-procedure	0.26	0.32	0.37
FWER	Lasso-ProG	0.03	0.08	0.23
	MS-Split	0.01	0.00	0.00
	KL-procedure	0.03	0.02	0.01

Table 4: This incorporates Table 9 of [van de Geer et al., 2014] and the procedure described in the text based on the Kullback-Leibler discrepancy

2.7.2 Real data

The real data includes three of the data sets used in [Dettling and Bühlmann, 2003], namely Leukemia ([Golub et al., 1999], [http://www-genome.wi.mit.edu/cancer/.](http://www-genome.wi.mit.edu/cancer/)), Colon ([Alon et al., 1999], [http://microarray.princeton.edu/oncology/.](http://microarray.princeton.edu/oncology/)) and Lymphoma ([Alizadeh et al., 2000], <http://lmpp.nih.gov/lymphoma/data/figure1>). A fourth data set SRBCT is included. All data sets were downloaded from <http://stat.ethz.ch/~dettling/bagboost.html>

A fifth data set, prostate cancer *prostate.rda* was downloaded from the *lasso2* package available from the CRAN R package repository.

The dependent variable $\mathbf{y}(n)$ is integer valued in all cases, each integer denoting a particular form, or absence, of cancer.

Least squares

The data set Leukemia was analysed in Section 2.1 using Proc1 with the p -values of the first five genes given (6). If this is repeated using Proc2 the result is

$$(38) \quad \begin{array}{rccccc} \text{gene number} & 979 & 2727 & 1356 & 2049 & 3054 \\ p\text{-value} & 0.0072 & 0.1324 & 0.7365 & 0.3646 & 0.7324 \end{array}$$

The problem considered in [Dettling and Bühlmann, 2003] is the classification of the form of cancer on the basis of the gene expressions. This will be done as in Section 2.1: firstly a stepwise L_2 regression is performed and terminated when the first p -value exceeds 0.05. To classify the cancer a linear regression is performed using the retained covariates and the resulting linear approximation rounded to 0 or 1. For the Proc1 procedure the classification is based on the genes 1182, 1219 and 2888. Only one tissue is misclassified. For the

Proc2 procedure the classification is based only on the gene 979. There are four misclassifications. The procedure Proc 3 gives the same result.

For the Lymphoma data the procedure Proc1 results in four genes with one misclassification. The first gene for procedure Proc2 has a p -value of 0.383 which is above the cut-off point. The procedure Proc3 gives two genes, 353 and 1772, and there are seven misclassifications. Thus although Proc3 performed well in the simulations it is dominated by Proc1 for the real data sets considered here. For this reason only the results for Proc1 are given.

The second line of Table 5 gives the sample size followed by the number of genes. The lines 4-8 give the first five genes and their p -values. The penultimate line gives the number of misclassifications firstly as a number and then as a percentage. The number in parentheses is the number of different classes. Finally the last line gives the number of possibly relevant genes calculated as described in Section 2.1.

Linear regression: least squares

Leukemia 72, 3571		Colon 62, 2000		Lymphoma 62, 4026		SRBCT 63, 2308		Prostate 102, 6033	
cov.	P -val.	cov.	P -val.	cov.	P -val.	cov.	P -val.	cov.	P -val.
1182	0.0000	493	7.40e-8	2805	0.0000	1389	2.32e-9	2619	0.0000
1219	8.57e-4	175	4.31e-1	3727	8.50e-9	1932	2.02e-7	203	5.75e-1
2888	3.58e-3	1909	5.16e-1	632	1.17e-4	1884	9.76e-5	1735	4.96e-1
1946	2.54e-1	582	3.33e-1	714	2.30e-2	1020	1.70e-1	5016	9.81e-1
2102	1.48e-1	1772	9.995e-1	2036	2.94e-1	246	6.75e-2	2940	9.52e-1
1, 1.39% (2)		9, 14.52% (2)		1, 1.61% (3)		13, 20.63% (4)		8, 7.77% (2)	
281		45		1289		115		185	

Table 5: Gene expression data: sample size and number of genes in the second row. The rows 4-8 give the first five covariates in order of inclusion and their p -values. The last but one row gives the number of misclassifications as described in the text and the number of classes in parentheses. The last line gives the number of relevant genes.

Suppose instead of classifying the colon data just on the basis of gene 493 the first four genes are included, 493, 175, 1909 and 582. This reduces the number of misclassifications from nine to two. Now replace all the colon covariates apart from covariate 493 by i.i.d. Gaussian white noise and classify on the basis of the first four ‘genes’. In one such experiment the number of misclassifications was four. Three repetitions resulted in five, eight and two misclassifications. This shows that the procedure successfully prevents over fitting by restricting the classification procedure to genes with small p -values.

Robust regression

Table 7 corresponds to Table 5. In all cases the first gene is the same. For the

Leukemia	4.15% (10)	1.39% (3)
Colon	14.52% (10)	9.14% (1)
Lymphoma	1.61% (10)	1.61% (3)

Table 6: Each row gives the form of cancer followed by the the lowest misclassification rate for all the methods considered in [Dettling and Bühlmann, 2003] based on 10 genes followed in turn by the misclassification rates and, in parentheses, the number of genes used for the procedure described in this paper.

lymphoma and SRBCT data sets the first five genes are the same and in the same order. Nevertheless there are differences which may be of importance.

One simple but, because of the nature of dependent variable, somewhat artificial example which demonstrates this it to change the first $\mathbf{y}(n)$ value for the colon data from 0 to -10. The first gene using least squares is now 1826 with a p -value of 0.352. This results not surprisingly in 23 misclassifications of the remaining 61 tissues. For the robust regression the first gene is again 493 with a p -value of 1.40e-5 which results in nine misclassifications as before.

In the real data examples considered here the dependent variable denotes a form of cancer and is therefore unlikely to contain outliers. Nevertheless the stepwise regression procedure can reveal outliers or exotic observations. Given residuals $r_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ a measure for the outlyingness of r_i is $|r_i|/s_n$ where $s_n = \text{median}(|r_1|, \dots, |r_n|)$. Hampel's 5.2 rule ([Hampel, 1985]) is to identify all observations whose outlyingness value exceeds 5.2 as outliers. For the leukemia data based on the first three covariates and using least squares the observations numbered 21, 32 and 35 were identified as outliers with outlyingness values 5.53, 9.78 and 5.96 respectively. The robust regression for the same data resulted in four outliers, 32, 33, 35 and 38 with values 18.0, 6.46, 18.42 and 7.50 respectively. The observations 32 and 35 are also identified by least squares but the outlyingness values for the robust regression are much larger .

Logistic regression

For the leukemia, colon and prostate data the dependent variate $\mathbf{y}$ takes on only the values zero and one. These data sets can therefore can be analysed using logistic regression and the Kullback-Leibler discrepancy (see Section 2.4). Table 8 gives the results corresponding to those of Table 5.

The second covariates for the leukemia and colon data exceed the cut-off p -value of 0.05 but could nevertheless be relevant. If they are included the number of misclassifications are zero and four respectively.

Robust linear regression

Leukemia 72, 3571		Colon 62, 2000		Lymphoma 62, 4026		SRBCT 63, 2308		Prostate 102, 6033	
cov.	<i>P</i> -val.	cov.	<i>P</i> -val.	cov.	<i>P</i> -val.	cov.	<i>P</i> -val.	cov.	<i>P</i> -val.
1182	1.11e-9	493	2.76e-5	2805	1.11e-10	1389	1.65e-5	2619	1.34e-12
2888	7.41e-5	449	5.04e-1	3727	8.82e-6	1932	4.65e-6	1839	1.47e-1
1758	2.35e-5	1935	1.26e-1	632	1.39e-3	1884	7.15e-4	2260	7.70e-3
3539	4.89e-2	175	8.95e-1	714	4.04e-2	1020	9.85e-2	1903	8.23e-1
3313	2.86e-2	792	1.86e-1	2036	3.71e-1	246	3.99e-2	5903	7.65e-1
1, 1.39% (2)		9, 14.52% (2)		1, 1.61% (3)		13, 20.63% (4)		8, 7.77% (2)	

Table 7: As for Table 5 but for robust regression

3 Acknowledgment

The author thanks Lutz Dümbgen for the exact p -value (3) and the proof. He also thanks Peter Bühlmann for help with [van de Geer et al., 2014] and Christian Hennig and Oliver Maclaren for helpful comments on earlier versions.

4 Appendix

Proof of (2).

The result and the following proof are due to Lutz Dümbgen. Given $\mathbf{y}(n)$ and k linearly independent covariates $\mathbf{x}_1(n), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k(n)$ with $k < n - 1$ consider the best linear approximation of $\mathbf{y}(n)$ by the $\mathbf{x}_j(n)$ in the $\|\cdot\|_2$ norm:

$$(\beta_1^*, \dots, \beta_k^*) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k} \|\mathbf{y}(n) - \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{x}_j(n) \beta_j\|_2.$$

The residual vector $\mathbf{r}_k(n) = \mathbf{y}(n) - \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{x}_j(n) \beta_j^*$ lies in the orthogonal complement V_0 of the space X_0 spanned by the $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$. The space V_0 is of dimension $n - k > 1$. Let $\mathbf{Z}(n) \notin X_0$ be an additional vector and consider the best linear approximation to $\mathbf{y}(n)$ based on $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{Z}(n)$. This is equivalent to considering the best linear approximation to $\mathbf{y}(n)$ based on $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, Q_0(\mathbf{Z}(n))$ where Q_0 is the orthogonal projection onto V_0 . The sum of squared residuals of this latter

$$SS_1 = ss_0 - \frac{(\mathbf{r}(n)^t Q_0 \mathbf{Z}(n))^2}{\|Q_0 \mathbf{Z}(n)\|_2^2}$$

where $ss_0 = \|\mathbf{r}(n)\|_2^2$. If $\mathbf{Z}(n)$ is standard Gaussian white noise then $Q_0 \mathbf{Z}(n)$ is standard Gaussian white noise in V_0 . Let $\mathbf{v}_1(n), \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-p_0}(n)$ be an orthonormal

Logistic regression: Kullback-Leibler

Leukemia		Colon		Prostate	
72, 3571		62, 2000		102, 6033	
cov.	<i>P</i> -val.	cov.	<i>P</i> -val.	cov.	<i>P</i> -val.
956	0.0000	377	2.12e-7	2619	0.0000
1356	8.14e-2	356	5.35e-2	4180	6.69e-1
264	1.00e-0	695	1.0000	1949	9.88e-1
6, 8.33%		10, 16.13%		9, 8.82%	

Table 8: Gene expression data corresponding to Table 5 for for logistic regression based on the Kullback-Leibler discrepancy.

basis of V_0 such that $\mathbf{r}(n) = \sqrt{ss_0}\mathbf{v}_1(n)$. Then

$$SS_1 = ss_0 \left(1 - \frac{(\mathbf{v}_1(n)^t Q_0 \mathbf{Z}(n))^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{n-p_0} (\mathbf{v}_j(n)^t Q_0 \mathbf{Z}(n))^2} \right)$$

which has the same distribution as

$$ss_0 \left(1 - \frac{Z_1^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{n-p_0} Z_j^2} \right)$$

where the Z_j are i.i.d $N(0, 1)$. This proves (2) on noting that the Z_j^2 are independent χ_1^2 random variables so that

$$\frac{Z_1^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{n-p_0} Z_j^2} \stackrel{D}{=} \frac{\chi_1^2}{\chi_1^2 + \chi_{n-p_0-1}^2} \stackrel{D}{=} B_{1/2, (n-p_0-1)/2}.$$

Proof of (5).

Let the required p -value for stopping be α . Then solving (3) for small p_0 leads to

$$\alpha = 1 - \text{pbeta}(x, 1/2, (n-1)/2)^{p(n)}.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pbeta}(x, 1/2, (n-1)/2) &= 1 - \frac{\Gamma(n/2)}{\Gamma(1/2)\Gamma((n-1)/2)} \int_x^1 u^{-1/2} (1-u)^{(n-1)/2} du \\ &\asymp 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_x^\infty u^{-1/2} \exp(-nu/2) du \\ &\asymp 1 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{nx}} \exp(-nx/2) \\ &= 1 - \exp(-0.5nx - 0.5(\log nx) + 0.5 \log(2/\pi)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pbeta}(x, 1/2, (n-1)/2)^{p(n)} &\asymp (1 - \exp(-0.5nx - 0.5(\log nx) + 0.5 \log(2/\pi)))^{p(n)} \\ &\asymp \exp(-p(n) \exp(-0.5nx - 0.5(\log nx) + 0.5 \log(2/\pi))) \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\log(-\log(1-\alpha)) \approx \log p(n) - 0.5nx - 0.5 \log nx + 0.5 \log(2/\pi).$$

On putting

$$x = (2 \log p(n) - \log \log(p(n)) - 2 \log(-\log(1-\alpha)) - \log \pi)/n$$

it is seen that

$$\log p(n) - 0.5nx - 0.5 \log nx + 0.5 \log(2/\pi) = \log(-\log(1-\alpha)) + o(1).$$

References

- [Alizadeh et al., 2000] Alizadeh, A., Eisen, M., Davis, R., Ma, C., Lossos, I., Rosenwald, A., Boldrick, J., Sabet, H., Tran, T., Yu, X., Powell, J., Yang, L., Marti, G., Moore, T., Hudson, J., Lu, L., Lewis, D., Tibshirani, R., Sherlock, G., Chan, W., Greiner, T., Weisenburger, D., Armitage, J., Warnke, R., Levy, R., Wilson, W., Grever, M., Byrd, J., Botstein, D., Brown, P., and Staudt, L. (2000). Distinct types of diffuse large B-cell lymphoma identified by gene expression profiling. *Nature*, 403:503–511.
- [Alon et al., 1999] Alon, U., Barkai, N., Notterman, D., Gish, K., Ybarra, S., Mack, D., and Levine, A. (1999). Broad patterns of gene expression revealed by clustering analysis of tumor and normal colon tissues probed by oligonucleotide arrays. *PNAS*, 96(12).
- [Bühlmann and van de Geer, 2011] Bühlmann, P. and van de Geer, S. (2011). *Statistics for High-Dimensional Data: Methods, Theory and Applications*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer.
- [Davies, 2014] Davies, L. (2014). *Data Analysis and Approximate Models*. Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability 133. CRC Press.
- [Davies, 2016a] Davies, P. L. (2016a). Functional choice and non-significance regions in regression. arXiv:1605.01936 [math.ST].
- [Davies, 2016b] Davies, P. L. (2016b). On stepwise regression. arXiv:1605.04542[math.ST].
- [Dettling and Bühlmann, 2003] Dettling, M. and Bühlmann, P. (2003). Boosting for tumor classification with gene expression data. *Bioinformatics*, 19(9):1061–1069.

- [Golub et al., 1999] Golub, T., Slonim, D., P., T., Huard, C., Gaasenbeek, M., Mesirov, J., Coller, H., Loh, M., Downing, J., Caligiuri, M., Bloomfield, C., and Lander, E. (1999). Molecular classification of cancer: class discovery and class prediction by gene expression monitoring. *Science*, 286(15):531–537.
- [Hampel, 1985] Hampel, F. R. (1985). The breakdown points of the mean combined with some rejection rules. *Technometrics*, 27:95–107.
- [Hosmer and Lemeshow, 1989] Hosmer, D. W. and Lemeshow, S. (1989). *Applied Logistic Regression*. Wiley, New York.
- [Huber and Ronchetti, 2009] Huber, P. J. and Ronchetti, E. M. (2009). *Robust Statistics*. Wiley, New Jersey, second edition.
- [Jia and Rohe, 2015] Jia, J. and Rohe, K. (2015). Preconditioning the lasso for sign consistency. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 9(1):1150–1172.
- [Lockhart et al., 2014] Lockhart, R., Taylor, J., Tibshirani, R. J., and Tibshirani, R. (2014). A significance test for the lasso. *Ann. Statist.*, 42(2):413–468.
- [Press et al., 2003] Press, W. H., Teukolsky, S. A., Vetterling, W. T., and Flannery, B. P. (2003). *Numerical Recipes in Fortran 77: The Art of Scientific Computing*, volume 1. Cambridge University Press, second edition.
- [van de Geer et al., 2014] van de Geer, S., Bühlmann, P., Ritov, Y., and Dezeure, R. (2014). On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models. *Annals of Statistics*, 42(3):1166–1202.